Tells the Facts and Names the Names

CounterPunch

JUNE 16-30, 1996 | *Ken Silverstein & Alexander Cockburn* | VOL. 3, NO. 12

IN THIS ISSUE

Four Futile Years: Special Report on Public Interest Groups in Clinton Time

- How Marian Wright Edelman Kept Her Mouth Shut While Bill Bashed Defenseless Children
- How Robin Hood Wants to Steal from Pregnant Teen Moms
- How Roberta Achtenberg Postured, Did Nothing in Lush HUD Job
- How ACORN Got $1 Million and Buttoned Its Lip
- How Citizen Action and Families USA Took a Dive on Health
- How Feminists Rallied Round Bill in Jones Case: "She Asked For It"
- How Double Standard Liberals Looked the Other Way on Whitewater
- How Clinton Joined the GOP and Liberal Watchdogs Never Even Barked

Plus

Morris Dees Uproar: The Scammer's Palace

Flacking for Bill

How Washington's Do-Good Crowd Sold Out

After almost four years of Bill Clinton, Washington's liberal advocacy groups, foundations and public interest networks resemble the Vichy French after six years of Nazi occupation: compliant servants of the occupying power, eager for patronage, grateful for a dinner invitation or even a friendly nod, always ready to load up the undesirables and ship them east.

Let's start with the most conspicuous defender of the poor in the capital today: Marian Wright Edelman, friend of Hillary Rodham Clinton, head of the Children's Defense Fund and a Democratic loyalist since her earliest days when she took the radical Head Start program in Mississippi and turned it into a sedate outreach program of the Democratic Party.

Edelman was the chief organizer and keynote speaker for a Stand for Children rally at the Lincoln Memorial last May. She is capable of fiery rhetoric; back in Reagan time quotable obloquy poured from her lips about R.R.'s preference for dollars over human lives, his shredding of "the tattered survival net" for welfare families, his shameful budgetary zeal to cut "lifeline programs for children and poor families through to the bone".

Yet on that sunny day in May, Edelman was amazingly restrained. No dissonance marred her rote pledges to "commit ourselves to building a just America that leaves no child behind". During her half-hour talk, Edelman praised one president directly — Abraham Lincoln — and obliquely criticized another — George Bush. The name of the current occupant of the White House — a man who had just endorsed a Republican program in Wisconsin which proposes to end welfare as an entitlement, requires almost all recipients to work, even though suitable jobs are largely unavailable and would put a five-year cap on lifetime benefits — never once crossed her lips.

One person not on hand to hear Edelman's pep talk was Man Sokheurm, a 14-year-old Cambodian boy whose leg had been blown off by a land mine. Man was in the United States as part of a Land Mines Awareness Tour and the organizers wanted him to stand on stage and tell his story. But Edelman and other conveners of the rally barred the lad, saying this was a day to focus on domestic issues. Then, too, Man's appearance might have embarrassed Bill Clinton, who had only recently decided that his administration would oppose a ban on land mines at an international conference in Geneva.

The collapse of the liberal advocates on the issue of children is matched by kindred surrender across the entire terrain of public policy, from budget balancing, to civil liberties, to crime, to health care. Pressed for explanations of their pusillanimity, liberal advocates explain that the Republican hordes who swept into Congress in 1994 were so barbaric, as is the prospect of a Dole presidency, that they have no choice but to circle the wagons around Bill Clinton.

But there are other, coarser reasons for their failure to criticize the administration, namely their own institutional, material and personal interests. Just as the Heritage Foundation and the American Enterprise Institute are closely tied to the GOP, the public interest sector, despite vows of non-partisanship, is firmly anchored to the Democrats. Consider the Food Research and Action Center, regarded as one of the most liberal public interest shops and a group whose stated purpose is to "eradicate hunger and undernutrition in the United States". The Center's board is comprised of Democratic Party hacks, business repre-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sentatives and, like the interlocking directorates of corporate America, officials from other public interest groups. Here you will find Carol Tucker Foreman, a food safety expert by day and lobbyist for companies such as Monsanto and Procter & Gamble by night; former New York congressman Thomas Downey, now a health care lobbyist; David Greenberg of Philip Morris; Louise Hilsen of Nestlé, USA; Virginia Weldon of Monsanto; Dagmar Farr of the Food Marketing Institute; Ron Pollack of Families USA, a non-profit that promotes health care reform; and Diann Rust-Tierney of the ACLU. The group's executive director is Robert Fersh, formerly a Democratic staff director at the House Agricultural Committee, so it's hardly surprising that the Food Research and Action Center has not been a high profile critic of the Clinton administration's budget cuts.

Many public interest leaders have personal ties to administration officials and supporters. Edelman, of course, is a close friend of Hillary Rodham Clinton and of Donna Shalala, head of Health and Human Services, both of whom previously chaired Edelman's board of directors for the Children's Defense Fund. Susan Thomases, a friend of Hillary Clinton who worked in the White House, has served on the Fund's board, as has Dennis Rivera, head of a hospital worker's union in New York City and a man who has said that the most important labor project of the past half century is to re-elect Bill Clinton. The Reagan/Bush era was a twelve-year period of exile for public interest groups. Their leaders are now invited to White House briefings, have access to cabinet secretaries and in some cases to the president himself. One public interest watcher puts it this way: "When you suddenly have an opening to power and you've got friends running agencies, it becomes very hard to be critical. You might not be in accord with the president, but you'll make your criticisms politely and quietly. You won't send out a mailing to your entire membership saying that the president looks like a baboon.".

Editors
KEN SILVERSTEIN
ALEXANDER COCKBURN

Production
TERRY ALLEN

Counselor
BEN SONNENBERG

Design
DEBORAH THOMAS

Published twice monthly except August, 22 issues a year:
$40 individuals,
$100 institutions,
$25 student/low-income
CounterPunch.
All rights reserved.
CounterPunch welcomes all tips, information and suggestions. Please call or write our offices.
CounterPunch
P.O. Box 18675,
Washington, DC 20036
202-986-3665 (phone/fax)

Clinton's biggest favor to liberals was to appoint large numbers to his administration. These liberal appointees have impressive titles but no influence on policy, their days largely spent shuffling papers about their desks. At the State Department, John Shattuck, who once worked at the ACLU, has been reduced to flacking for Clinton's ghastly human rights record, even his cave-in on China. While at Public Citizen's Congress Watch Michael Waldman promoted campaign finance reform. As a special assistant to the president for policy coordination with an $85,000 dollar per year salary, he has covered for his boss's fervent courtship of corporate money. Before a 1994 fundraising dinner at a hotel in downtown Washington, Waldman told the press, "While we're working to reform this campaign finance system, the Democratic Party is not going to unilaterally disarm." Then he went inside and joined Clinton and 2,000 well-heeled powerful interests for a pleasant meal of steak and salmon which raised $3.5 million for the Democratic National Committee.

Because she is a lesbian, Roberta Achtenberg became a lighting rod for the right when she was named as HUD's assistant secretary for fair housing and equal opportunity, an office with substantial influence on issues such as insurance redlining, fair lending and housing discrimination. Achtenberg was a favorite of gays and of housing groups, whose leaders she regularly invited in for consultations. But she was a do-nothing. She took no serious initiatives on social issues and never even managed to recruit her senior staff before she resigned in 1995 to run for mayor of San Francisco. After defeat, she was rehired as a HUD consultant.

One thing liberal groups certainly have got out of HUD is money. The Department's Fair Housing Initiative Program, which doles out funds to non-profits to enforce lending discrimination laws, has given more than $1,000,000 to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now. As with the Food Research and Action Center, ACORN's criticism of the Clinton administration has been muted, the need for reform seemingly not as urgent as the group's name suggests.

All through the first half of 1996 Clinton whacked happily away at his favorite targets, young black mothers and their children. The campaign opened in his January State of the Union address, with a presidential rallying of the national purpose to bear down on pregnant teens. In the wake of this address, representatives of liberal advocacy groups mustered in the White House for private colloquy on further strategies to scare black youngsters into seemly continence. (For reasons of political tact the advocates forebore to cite the ethnic origin of these prolific teen mothers, though everyone knew whom they were talking about. One researcher from the Progressive Policy Institute confided to a friend the necessity of getting photos of white teen moms.)

The causes of rising pregnancy rates among black teen mothers are far from mysterious. Between 1960 and 1980 birthrates among black and white teens in Washington DC fell, the former by nearly half. With the onset of the Reagan era in 1980, following preliminary erosion of Great Society programs by Nixon and Carter, the black teen birthrate rocketed up while the white birthrate continued to fall. At three percent, white teen birthrates in Washington DC are now below those of Sweden, whereas the black teen birthrates, now at 30 percent, resemble those of a Third World country.

By the late 1980s liberal advocates should have been concentrating their fire on the root cause of teen violence and pregnancy — poverty. But by then the right had locked on to its family values campaign and liberals were desperate to carve themselves a piece of the action.

(continued on p. 4)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Myth Of Morris Dees: Fall-Out Continues

Our May 16-30 issue on Morris Dees and the Southern Poverty Law Center provoked a big uproar, with NBC, ABC, *USA Today* and other outlets calling to ask about the story. Mail to **CounterPunch** was also heavy.

The overwhelming number of comments we received were favorable, with many coming from Law Center donors who thanked us for opening their eyes. One person wrote us to say she had made a small contribution to the Center a few years ago and within days received a call from someone at Dees' operation asking her write the Center into her will. Bill Martin, a South Carolina native now living in Chicago, wrote, "I enjoyed the piece on Morris Dees ... [but] I wish you had exposed the way that Dees specifically pimps off an image of the South that is comfortable and useful to liberals living elsewhere in the US ... Liberals find comforting the idea of a rural South that is supposedly 'alien' to them, and to the enlightened, sophisticated, urban North. It lets them off the hook and all the better for the liberal conscience if a few dollars can be sent to someone like Dees."

We have heard many other interesting stories about Dees from our readers. A person who once spent the night at Dees' house described it as the most spectacular private residence he'd ever seen, adding that the black servants tending to the guests and immaculate grounds reminded him of a plantation. We also received a copy of a letter that Joseph Lowery of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference sent to Dees a few years ago, criticizing him for endorsing Reagan/Bush appointees to the federal bench such as Edward Carnes, a death penalty fanatic, and Sam Currin, a North Carolina protégé of Jesse Helms whom the senate rejected. Lowery wrote, "I find it difficult to comprehend why anyone committed to civil rights and justice in the judicial system would fight to affirm [these] appointments. Even if one endorsed a candidate, it is not quite the same as the major, huge, intensive campaign you waged [for Carnes] in the face of the entire civil rights community which, in spite of your statement that 'it died with Dr. King', is alive and kicking and resisting and resenting what many consider to be an assault on the agenda for justice in the criminal justice system." Finally, we heard about the four-times married Dees' uplifting views toward women. After reviewing court records pertaining to his first (his then-wife claimed that Dees had, among many distasteful deeds, impregnated a juror from one of his cases) we urge the Southern Poverty Law Center to stay away from cases of sexual harassment.

"Dees specifically pimps off an image of the South that is comfortable and useful to liberals living elsewhere."

Michael Funke of Detroit wrote, "Too bad you can't find the time and energy to write up the dangers of militia/Wise Use racists you prefer to champion. Your priorities are all fucked up! Which side are you on?" Reviewing past issues of **CounterPunch** we have not come across a single favorable reference to the militias. In fact, we've never written about the militias at all, largely because that topic has been covered extensively elsewhere in the press — unlike the case of Morris Dees' exploitation of civil rights. We have regularly criticized the Wise Use Movement, most recently in our April 15 issue when we called it an "anti-green" group and discussed its funding from oil giant ARCO.

Dan Pens, a prisoner in Washington state, accused us of "sleazy" journalism, though he offered no rebuttal to our charges that the Law Center raises millions of dollars with fraudulent fundraising solicitations and uses little of that money to defend poor people or civil rights. Pens' defense of Dees, hardly a ringing one, was to say that the Law Center had once sent his prisoners' rights organization a check for $5,000. If occasional donations to worthwhile causes served as exoneration, almost every major corporation in America, including those employing prison labor, would be off the hook.

Richard Cohen, the Law Center's legal director, wrote to say that the things we wrote about him were not true. The only mention of Cohen we made was to quote an ex-Center employee, Christine Lee, who said that he condescendingly nicknamed her "Little Girl". Lee stands by her statement. Cohen also wrote that "*The Weekly Standard*, a conservative rag, recently ran a hatchet job about Morris and the Center. Maybe it all goes to show that when you have enemies on both the right and the left, you must be doing something right." Poor Richard, trapped between ideological extremes, just like those Central American governments of the 1980s.

A few years ago *The Other Side* published a "Giver's Guide" which ranked 123 charitable organizations. Here's what the magazine had to say about the Southern Poverty Law Center:

"SPLC says it provides legal services to poor blacks harmed by Ku Klux Klan-type activities. The bulk of its work, however, is the aggressive distribution of junk mail, soliciting funds for more junk mail. ... Now and then, SPLC actually provides some worthwhile legal assistance. But mostly it's learned that there are a lot of people who will give large amounts of money to 'help stop the KKK.' And SPLC, for the most part, just feeds off that benevolence. ... This is the kind of organization that saps the financial strength of a caring public. ... You'd have to be absolutely bonkers to give SPLC a penny." ■

He-e-e-re's Babylon

Washington Babylon, *our new book intimately detailing the corruption of the political establishment, has just hit the book-stores. In bipartisan fashion, we savage Republicans and Democrats alike. We are offering* **Washington Babylon** *to* **CounterPunch** *subscribers for $16.40 (includes postage), a discount of 20 percent.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Flacking, continued from p. 2)
Salvation came in the form of the poor teen moms, an alluringly defenseless target with the added attraction of not being likely to vote. A film clip from that time shows Marian Wright Edelman sitting on the rotting porch of a shack in West Virginia, surrounded by some of the poorest people in America. Brooding on the problem of teen pregnancy, Edelman blames ... MTV.

In 1995, in its Great Transition report, the Carnegie Institute's Council on Adolescent Development was blaming teen pregnancy, sexually transmitted disease, AIDS, rape, drug abuse and violence on "peer group culture". Poverty, racism and adult physical abuse barely found their way into the report. Not to be outdone by Carnegie, that other Washington landmark of liberal advocacy, the Brookings Institution, promoted the apocalyptic thunderings of its distinguished fellow, John Diulio, a Princeton criminologist and member of Bill Bennett's Council on Crime. Diulio blazed a Sherman-like path through the talk shows and opinion columns warning of a coming generation of "superpredators", robbing, raping and killing without pity or remit. Now, there are legitimate grounds for arguing that if present policies on income distribution are pursued, there will be more violence. That would have been the posture of the liberal advocates in an earlier time. Today Brookings sponsors a man whose core message is that teenagers are innately afflicted.

It remained for the New York-based Robin Hood Foundation to point the way to the obvious conclusion. The Robin Hood Foundation was founded in 1987 by Paul Tudor Jones II, who made pots of money in the commodities market. His board is adorned by Edelman, John F. Kennedy, Jr., and Jann Wenner, publisher of Rolling Stone, which is chockfull of ads exploiting teen sexuality. In a report issued in June, Robin Hood's merrie researchers announced ominously that taxpayers would be required to spend nearly $7 billion this year dealing with social problems stemming from girls under 18 having babies. The $7 billion in costs were construed from such expenditures as welfare and food stamp benefits, increased foster care expenses, prison construction and lost work time from the young moms who would otherwise be bent over sewing machines, working at 7/Elevens and in diverse other ways swelling the gross national product. By way of comparison, between 1992 and 1993 the nation spent an additional $9.7 billion in cost of living increases on social security payments to retired workers. Predictably, there are no howls from Robin Hood about how the richer old folk are stealing from the pay packets of the younger poor folk. Old people vote.

The Robin Hood study did admit that teenagers don't benefit economically by delaying childbirth till they are 20 or 21. In fact there have been some interesting public health studies — zealously ignored by the teen-haters — showing that for a poor black mom there are some sound reasons to have the babies early: a healthier body, a family support network still in place, rather than exhausted or dead. The tacit premise of the Robin Hood Foundation's report is that there is no "good" time for poor women to have children.

"Not one of those flaunted, vaunted advocacy groups forever protecting the interests of the children and the helpless and the homeless and the what-you-will ..."

—Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan

In addition to supplying much ideological ammunition for the teen-haters, liberal advocates have failed to vigorously challenge Clinton's outrageous welfare proposals. In 1994, Edelman sent the president a sharply worded memo attacking his plans but then refused to give it to the press. Finally, last November, Edelman went public with an op-ed article in *The Washington Post* in which she said that Clinton's repudiation of a Republican welfare was a "defining moral litmus test for your presidency". Clinton did back away after Republican ultras loaded up the bill with provisions he couldn't stomach. A suppressed study done by Donna Shalala's HHS showed that the GOP plan Clinton had initially supported would push one million more children into poverty. During one savage tirade against the bill, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan let fly from the floor of Congress: "There are very few advocacy groups outside. You can stand where I stand and look straight out at the Supreme Court, not a person in between that view. Not one of those flaunted, vaunted advocacy groups forever protecting the interests of the children and the helpless and the homeless and the what-you-will." Indeed, the welfare crowd has been so timid in its criticism of Clinton that Donna Shalala at one point was frantically telephoning the lethargic liberal advocates in Washington's public interest groups and urging them to speak out against the president's proposals.

On health care, a dominant theme in Clinton's 1992 campaign, the liberal advocates collapsed with similar speed. Before Clinton took office there was a vibrant coalition of grassroots folk which promoted a single payer health care system, based on the Canadian model. Clinton courted the single payer movement but had little sympathy for its ideas. His plan was forged by a group of technocrats mustered in the Jackson Hole group, an outfit whose $600,000 budget was provided by Aetna Life & Casualty, Prudential Insurance and Metropolitan Life. Shortly after Clinton's election, hundreds of single payer advocates gathered in Little Rock, with one group of activists holding a small protest at the governor's. The public interest leadership was horrified by this lack of decorum. Cathy Hurwit of Citizen Action chastised the marchers and demanded that such wildcat action must never happen again.

The Little Rock feud foreshadowed rumblings in the public interest sector which erupted when Clinton issued his health care plan in 1993. Many of the liberal groups lined up behind the Clinton plan, while maintaining that they still preferred single payer, at least in theory. These included Consumers Union, Citizen Action, the National Council of Senior Citizens, the American Public Health Association and a number of unions.

The sell-out by Citizen Action is instructive on the way the world works. One top figure in Citizen Action, Michael Podhorzer, is married to Carol Browner, Clinton's head of the EPA and a former associate director of Citizen Action (Podhorzer has since moved on to AFSCME). In early 1993, Citizen Action's Heather

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Booth, a woman with a long history of grassroots organizing, took a job at the Democratic National Committee. Later that year Citizen Action's DC director, Robert Brandon, left the group to form a private consulting firm, whose first client was the DNC.

Soon, Citizen Action was dragging Ira Magaziner out to meet with its organizers in the field, though most remained unimpressed with Clinton's approach. Citizen Action also began attacking the few groups — Ralph Nader's Public Citizen, the Gray Panthers and the United Electrical Workers Union, among others — who wanted to launch a grassroots campaign to pressure Clinton towards the single payer model. "The grassroots was completely divided from the leadership, which was set on a beltway strategy," one single payer advocate recalls. This person joked that the grassroots activists realized they couldn't support the Clinton plan when the only slogans they could come up with were, "Heh, heh, ho, ho, arguably better than the status quo" and "What do we want? Universal coverage! When do we want it? When the savings are realized!"

Another group with a curious posture in the health care debate was Families USA, which had once supported a Canadian-style approach but became the Clinton plan's most eager and important backer. Families USA's shift away from single payer had begun in the early-1990s and intensified after a 1991 meeting between Clinton, then already contemplating a run for the presidency, and the group's head, Ron Pollack. Pollack was later made a campaign adviser to Clinton and following the 1992 election was a regular guest at the White House. Families USA had other solid ties to the Democratic Party. The group's biggest funder and board chairman is Philipe Villers, a big Democratic donor. The board also includes Douglas Fraser, former head of the UAW, Judith Feder, who was director of health policy in the Clinton/Gore transition team and who served at HHS under Shalala and Esther Peterson, a former adviser to Presidents Jimmy Carter and Lyndon Johnson.

The American Association of Retired People has a very progressive constituency but it bitterly opposed the single payer plan, calling it an example of "big government" — an odd charge since it is the same one that conservatives use in seeking to gut Medicare, the AARP's favorite program. The Association's leadership rarely drew attention to the fact that the AARP makes roughly $100 million per year by marketing insurance, money which would go down the drain with a single payer system. Now that the AARP is entering the HMO field, any calls for rigorous health care reform from the group are unlikely.

Advocacy groups have also been dishonest about the debates on Medicaid and Medicare. Despite all the campaign rhetoric, the Clinton administration and the GOP proposals are not so terribly divergent. The latest proposals from the Republicans call for spending cuts over the next six years of $168 billion in Medicare and $72 billion in Medicaid. Clinton calls for cuts of $124 billion and $59 billion, respectively. The president's proposals contain some features that are less severe than those put forth by Newt's troops, especially in seeking to preserve the entitlement status of Medicaid, but Clinton would not only cut total spending but also implement a new per capita ceiling on limits to recipients.

Donna Shalala had to phone snoozing welfare protectors to urge them to denounce the cuts.

Yet public interest groups have focused their fire on the GOP, labeling House Republicans as social Cro-Mags while allowing Clinton to portray himself as the defender of the elderly and the poor. Last December Families USA mustered signatures for a letter praising the president for standing firm on Medicaid. The signers, who included the AIDS Action Council, the Children's Defense Fund and the National Women's Law Center, were rewarded with an invitation to the White House to watch Clinton's Saturday radio address. Later the guests eagerly lined up for a photo session with their hero.

Placated by Clinton's pro-choice stance and deeply enamored of Hillary, feminist groups have joined with other liberals in defending Clinton's conduct in the Whitewater affair, as well as the personal and professional conduct of the First Family. Back in March of 1994, Lynn Cutler, a Democratic Party hack at the Kamber Group, organized a $50,000 campaign to place ads in *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post* and other big newspapers. The ads — signed by feminists such as Ellen McLean, head of Emily's List, and Judith Lichtman, president of the Women's Legal Defense Fund; by lobbyists including Peter Kelly and Peter Knight, now head of the Clinton/Gore re-election campaign; and by celebrities such as Tony Randall and Joanne Woodward — essentially declared that all the parties involved in the Whitwater affair were innocent — a viewpoint rejected by a Little Rock jury last May. It is doubtful that any of the signers had the slightest idea of what the Whitewater case was about. Cutler herself told the press that the furor over the case was simply a means of sabotaging the Clinton administration's health care proposal, which her firm was promoting at the behest of union clients (later, Clinton named Cutler as a permanent delegate to the International Conference on Women in Peking).

David Hale, the owner of Capital Management Services, licensed by the Small Business Administration to dispose of low-interest loans for minority

SUBSCRIPTION INFO

Enter/renew subscription here:

☐ One year individual, $40
☐ One year institution, $100
☐ One year student/low-income, $25
☐ Please send back issue(s) _____ ($3/issue)
☐ I am enclosing a separate sheet for gift subscriptions

Name_____

Address_____

City/State/Zip_____

_____

Payment must accompany order.
Add $10 for foreign subscriptions.
Make checks payable to: **CounterPunch.**
Return to: **CounterPunch.**
P.O. Box 18675
Washington, DC 20036

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

contractors, has admitted that he made an illegal loan to the Whitewater Development Corporation. Hale further claims that Governor Clinton twisted his arm to set up the SBA loan to Whitewater. Even assuming that Hale's charges about Clinton are pure lies, try to imagine the uproar among liberals if Ronald Reagan's closest business associates had diverted SBA money into the hands of Reagan's cronies in California. Now try to imagine the outcry if Nancy Reagan had parlayed a $1,000 investment in the commodities market into a $100,000 profit; with her account being handled by a close adviser to one of the nation's most powerful firms and a close friend of California Governor Ronald Reagan (recall that it was Jim Blair of Tyson Foods who handled Hillary's trades); and with Mrs. Reagan's account at one point $117,500 short, at which point a call would have wiped her and her husband out and destroyed their careers.

Finally, consider the case of Paula Jones. Feminist groups eagerly seek out high profile cases to dramatize sexual harassment. When the highest profile case imaginable landed on their doorstep, they locked the door and hid. Even though Jones's charges had the ring of truth, leaders from the women's movement revelled in James Carville's description of Jones as "trailer park trash". Susan Estrich, formerly Michael Dukakis's campaign manager and a professor of law at the University of Southern California, was one of many feminist leaders to deride Jones as a hussy who, if she indeed had been the target of unwanted advances from Clinton, had essentially got what she deserved. "Just because you're a feminist doesn't mean you have to believe every woman,"

"Just because you're a feminist doesn't mean you have to believe every woman."

Estrich wrote in *USA Today*. "Going to a hotel room under the circumstances Jones claimed is the sort of thing we should be teaching our daughters not to do if their interests are solely professional."

Nothing has been too awkward for the liberal advocates to swallow, even the destruction of basic constitutional freedoms. When Clinton's anti-terrorism bill (now law) promised star chamber justice for immigrants and draconian provisions against "front organizations" outstripping even the frenzies of the 1950s, the ACLU had to go to the National Rifle Association and the Cato Institute to find allies in its battle.

Even the president's agreement to the Republicans' goal of balancing the federal budget over seven years — without raising taxes or cutting military spending — drew little more than a yawn from the public interest crowd. Yet with that step alone Clinton accepted a plan which, if implemented, would result in a 30 percent cut in discretionary social spending and mark the death knell for programs for the poor. Under the terms of Clinton's 1997 budget, federal spending on education would decline to half what it was when Reagan took office. Spending on R&D would decline to its lowest level in modern times. Spending on pollution control would plummet to the level of1972, the dawn of Nixon's green revolution. So much for Clinton's core platform of "investment" in education and training, the environment, science and technology.

Citing these figures, Doug Henwood concluded in his *Left Business Observer*: "Clinton can declare black to be white with the best of them. His major environmental initiative in the budget offers tax breaks for the cleanup and development of poisoned land; one can't say for sure, but that sounds like a subsidy to real estate developers in green disguise. (That's the way it's worked in the New York area.) His proposal to push more Medicare recipients into HMOs is described as 'providing more choice.' His health care spending cuts are described as 'strengthening Medicare and Medicaid.' Welfare cuts are described as promoting work and protecting children. His vision of austerity and free trade is designed to 'create an age of possibility.' It's almost enough to make you nostalgic for Nixon."

It's the truth, but you won't hear it from the public interest liberals in Babylon. ■

CounterPunch
P.O. Box 18675
Washington, DC 20036

Note to Subscribers

A number of subscribers have been confused about the expiration date on their subs. Please note your expiration date on the mailing label. The first number refers to issue number and the second to year. Hence, 10/97 means your sub ends with the 10th issue of 1997 (the May 16-31 issue). Just look at our masthead to see which numbered issue you are reading. So please remember: the first number — 10 in the above example — DOES NOT refer to the month your sub expires.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED